

been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Chuah et al. and also under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chuah et al. in view of Voit et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,157,636). Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner clearly define the art that the claims are rejected under as well as clarify the discrepancy with the rejection of claims 19 and 20 in a non-final Office Action.

Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1 and 8 recite a feature whereby “said AAAL device automatically identifies a lower-charge communication network based on said charge information to determine whether a position registration request for said mobile terminal should be allowed or not.”

In the present invention, an AAAL determines the possibility of a connection with respect to a mobile terminal and network. That is, as explained from page 17, line 22 to page 18, line 14 of the present specification, the mobile terminal proposes its ordinary charge to an AAAL. Then, the AAAL permits the connection if the ordinary charge is less expensive than other network charges.

This feature is not shown any of the cited art. Chuah only discloses at col. 2, lines 5-32 that V/IP will be one service offered by internet service providers. This generic description by itself would not suggest a motivation for automatically identifying a *lower-charge* communication network. Further, there is no judgment about the possibility of connection. Voit et al., as cited by the Examiner discloses general routing of Internet telephone calls routing, and not in the context of a network/ AAAL device at all. In addition, the connections in Chuah, as

discussed above, are based on subscriber relationships. This individual, one-to-one connection among networks teaches away from identifying a lower-charge communication network.

In addition, Chuah also does not disclose the claim 1 features of “an AAAL device provided in over the Internet” and “wherein said AAAL device ... should be allowed or not.” With these features, a mobile terminal could be authenticated in a manner not suggested by the cited art.

Claims 2, 3, 9, 10, and 15-20

Claims 2, 3, 9, 10, and 15-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Chuah et al. First, Applicants note that claims 2, 3, and 15-18 ultimately depend on claim 1, and that claims 9, 10, 17, and 18 depend from claim 8. The Examiner is requested to explain the discrepancy since the independent claims were rejected under Chuah et al (U.S. Pat. No. 6,409,722, Chuah hereafter) in view of Voit et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,157,636).

In view of the multiple inconsistencies in the Office Action, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner issue a non-final Office Action clearly defining the rejections and the cited art.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

RESPONSE UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
U.S. Application No. 09/987,517

Attorney Docket No. Q67254

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Ronald Kimble
Registration No. 44,186

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: February 28, 2006